Comparing Urban Difference

Learning from Jerusalem and Stockholm

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
"DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY"

by

Jonathan Rokem

Submitted to the Senate of Ben-Gurion University
of the Negev

1st January 2014

Beer-Sheva

Acknowledgements

The last four years have been a fascinating transnational journey, with several people assisting in different stages of my PhD research. I apologies if I unintentionally forgot to mention someone and thank everyone for their contribution to the completion of what has been a central part of my life in the last four years. In many ways the research is a reflection of the two different cultural backgrounds that have had the strongest influence on my life so far. It is now time to wrap it all up and put this research project into writing.

First and foremost, I want to thank my family, my wife Michal and my sons Ben and Adam, without their limitless love and patience during long working days and positive encouragement and support this PhD project would not have come to completion.

To my wonderful parents Ann Marie and Stefan for their infinite love and support and for reading and sending feedback on several drafts of the text.

To my PhD advisor, Dr. Haim Yacobi, who from the very start shard the enthusiasm of the core research ideas and has been a great mentor and inspiration and for his ongoing guidance and support.

To the Department of Politics and Government at Ben Gurion University of the Negev for granting me a warm and welcoming academic home for the last four years and for their continued support. To the Heads of Department; Prof. Dani Filc and Prof. Neve Gordon, to the departmental manager Nurit Klien, and to my fellow friends and PhD colleagues, Mori Ram, Oren Shlomo and Beni Nuriely for sharing the ups and downs of the PhD path together. To my dear friend and colleague Adam Kassa from the London School of Economics for his great feedback and encouraging support on the final drafts of my work and Chloe Massey for her professional proofreading.

To Dr. Oliver Tourney and the whole team at the French Research Center Jerusalem (CRFJ) for granting me the Bettencourt Schueller Research Fellowship in the fourth and final year of my PhD research. To Dr. Sharon Pardo and The Centre for the Study of European Politics and Society (CSEPS) at Ben Gurion University for their important support of my field work in the third year.

In Stockholm; to Yvonne Rock for her great mentorship and local connections, to Lief Magnosson and Tobies Hübinette from the Multicultural Center, Fittja (MKC) for their local support, and to

Gustav Friedlund and Pravnah Sharafi from Butkyrka Municipality for their assistance with the Fittja interviews and field work. To Lars Marcus and Ann Legeby from the School of Architecture (KTH) for assisting with the Stockholm maps.

In Jerusalem; to Dr. Dalia Dromi, Efrat Cohen Bar, Sri Kurnish and Nava Sheer, from Bimkom for assisting with Jerusalem maps and interviews and Noa Shvedron from the Jerusalem Municipality for assisting with the Jerusalem and the Al-Isawiyyah interviews and field work.

In Tel Aviv; to Shay Efrati, for producing the urban segregation maps, to Sarit Ben Simhon-Peleg for the hospitality at Tel Aviv University, and to Idelson 10 café Dizengof Tel Aviv, for several hours of writing with excellent cups of coffee.

Last, to the late Prof. Arie Sachar who was the first inspiration and mentor who introduced me to the field of urban planning, inspiring me to continue my Master's degree at the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE).

This PhD is dedicated with love to my family, my wife Michal and my sons Ben and Adam.

Contents:

List of Figures and Tables **page**

Abstract

The reality of spatial and social divisions in “contested” cities has been recognized in urban studies for over a century. Such cities are characterized by divisions of group membership and residential segregation. On the one hand, this loose definition of “divided city” spans a wide comparative range. On the other hand, a growing body of knowledge points particularly to "extremely divided cities" (EDC). These are cities claimed to contain extreme ethno - national divisions originating from an active national conflict and a contestation of the nation state. It has been argued that these cities contain distinctive attributes positioning them within an exclusive discourse differentiating them from other urban areas. Some of the well-known examples include: Baghdad, Beirut, Belfast, Derry/Londonderry, Jerusalem, Mostar, Nicosia, Kirkuk and Sarajevo.

The term "ordinary cities" proposed by Robinson (2006) advocates thinking of all cities as "ordinary". The significance of comparing different cities with diverse histories and contexts has important implications for a growing need to re-think pre-defined 'labels' and 'concepts' attributed to cities and neighborhoods. With this observation in mind, my central argument in this research is that it is timely to start learning from, and comparing across "extremely divided cities" (EDC), as part of the "ordinary cities" framework.

My PhD project’s theoretical meta-objectives are twofold, firstly; to move away from the usual comparison within the EDC and comparative urban studies more generally of 'most similar cases'. Secondly, the research suggests that rather than limiting the 'extremely divided city' (EDC) label to a selected number of places, there is an increasing need to broaden the category itself. Within this discussion, there is a still significant lacuna as to how researchers and policymakers themselves conceptualize and prioritize the socially and politically contentious issues and the “challenges of understanding urban segregation” (Vaughan & Arbaci 2011) in different cities.

My main aims in this PhD research were threefold. First, to explore in-depth, empirically grounded case studies of two 'different cities'; one labeled as 'ordinary' (Stockholm) and one 'deeply divided' (Jerusalem). Secondly, to understand differences and similarities of urban segregation in Stockholm and Jerusalem as an attempt to critique the extremely divided cities (EDC) label. Thirdly, it is my intention to use the findings from my research to address recent changes in the contemporary urban present. In so doing I intend to shape and advance a general theoretical and practical understanding of urban division and segregation bridging the current lacuna in the literature that differentiates extremely divided cities (EDC) from other, more ordinary urban areas.

> **The core research question is:** ***How and in what ways is urban segregation in "ordinary cities" becoming increasingly similar or different to urban segregation in "extremely divided cities" (EDC)?***

My core research assumption is that cities with diverse forms of urban segregation are starting to develop comparable patterns. I establish this working hypothesis with a critical reading of the existing literature as well as a comparative investigation of Sweden (known for its leading progressive welfare system) and Israel (known for its ethnic oriented policies); selecting two urban case studies; Stockholm and Jerusalem and two selected local neighbourhood case studies; Al-Isawiyyah (a Palestinian neighbourhood in East Jerusalem) and Fittja (an immigrant dense outer suburb south of Stockholm) conducting site visit and intervierws with planners and residetns during 2010-2013.

Methodologically, with the aim of establishing a comparative framework; the research integrates three main scales of investigation: **(**1) the nation state role in planning for urban segregation, (2) urban segregation at the city scale, and (3) the role of local community and civil society in, and their perception of, these urban processes.

The comparative framework set out to investigate three main themes: (I) Housing; (II) Transport; and, (III) Civil society involvement in planning. Deriving from the research findings four additional patterns were established: (i) institutional segregation; (ii) urban violence; (iii) case study resemblance; and (iv) planning

discourses. By examining three pre-defined common themes and four additional patterns across Jerusalem and Stockholm, establishing a *partial multi-themed analytic comparative conversation*, this method opens up the debate about convergence between cities with different causal factors (Pickvance 1986, 2005). To better adapt planning policy and practice to ethnic minorities and migrants in an ever more fractured urban reality.

In **Chapter 1,** the research focuses on a broad theoretical reading of urban segregation and division relevant to this study. The comparative framework and other methodological tools are further outlined in **Chapter 2**. In **Chapter 3**, planning and geopolitics is analysed in Israel and Sweden and Jerusalem and Stockholm across different scales (national, regional and urban). The neighbourhood scale field research is based on the two selected local case studies of Al-Isawiyyah and Fittja in **Chapter 4**. The research will conclude with an analysis of how concepts, methodologies and policies regarding the consequences and approaches to manage socio-spatial disparities in cities, are devised, transferred and negotiated between different actors and institutions. This is elaborated in the comparative discussion of my findings in **Chapter 5**.

Thus, the theoretical contribution this research makes is by comparing two cities seen as plural and incommensurable in urban studies and planning literature (Robinson 2011), revealing what we can learn from comparing across most different cases. On the empirical level, the two main issues my PhD addressed are; firstly, from the spatial perspective; given different political regimes in each country, how over the last half century does the history of the city's spatial evaluation and the history of the city's patterns of migration and settlement pan out on the ground? And, secondly, focusing on the social, how is urban segregation conceptualized and acted upon by local residents and planners at different levels and stages of bottom-up and top-down initiatives of urban policy formation in different social and cultural contexts.

Key words: Comparative Urbanism, Urban Segregation, Divided Cities, Urban Geopolitics, Urban planning policy, Jerusalem, Stockholm**,** Israel, Sweden**.**

i. Personal note - reasons for embarking on this research project

Growing up in Jerusalem, two fundamental aspects made manifest in everyday life were the extreme divisions and tensions in the urban space. Subsequent to spending most of my adolescent years in Jerusalem, I moved to London for six years to complete my Master's degree in urban planning and work in the field. Living in London, I was fortunate enough to travel throughout Europe where an increasing awareness developed: the grand urban theories promoting social inclusion (Le Corbusier 1941), diversity and the celebration of public space (Habermas 1962) were not living up to the liberal democratic promise of social justice and freedom. On the contrary, my experiences from Jerusalem and its contested and divided urban fabric were becoming more familiar in several cities throughout Europe. This led me to question the reasons for the parity of these urban phenomena, particularly since

policies and political conditions in these cities (such as London, Paris and Stockholm) were starkly more favorable then in Jerusalem.

To better comprehend why the aforementioned observations from Jerusalem were taking place where conditions are categorically much more favorable, the research set out to investigate and compare division patterns in two different divided and segregated cities. Over the course of the last four years, I spent substantial amounts of time observing and investigating urban social and spatial conditions in Jerusalem and Stockholm.

In Jerusalem, research took place in weekly visits, spending large amounts of time in the city. The research in Stockholm was more intermittent, with three research visits respectively lasting a few weeks. In terms of initial familiarity, I had substantial experience and knowledge of planning matters in Jerusalem from former research and professional activities; starting from attending primary and secondary school in central Jerusalem and continuing with my undergraduate education at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. In London I wrote my Master's dissertation about Jerusalem's urban planning policy, and, after returning to Israel in 2008, I worked as an urban planner; first as an activist with a local NGO, and later from a public sector perspective working at Israel's Central Planning Administration coordinating a new national master plan for Israel (TAMA 1).
With the Stockholm case, there was arguably less initial familiarity. Even though I speak fluent Swedish, had spent most of my childhood summers there, and have most of my extended family currently living there, there was a process of getting to know the local environment from a more critical academic and professional perspective. To confront this knowledge gap in the Stockholm case, I undertook an in-depth investigation of planning policies and development over the last twenty years.

To capture a more nuanced picture of each city and its specific circumstances, a top-down as well as bottom-up investigation of the conditions was undertaken employing three main scales of investigation: (1) the role of the nation state within housing and planning policy; (2) the implementation of planning at the urban scale; and (3) the role of local planners, community leaders and civil society in, and their perception of, these urban processes. In both cities a set of over thirty interviews were conducted

with urban planners, academics, civil society leaders and community activists. The choice of qualitative research methods stems from the interest in capturing the social and spatial context in the fullest and most nuanced narrative revealing the incongruity and mutations within the different discourses (see: chapter 2 for a full review). Moving from my personal experience and background, I set out to explore what we can learn from comparing urban difference in Jerusalem and Stockholm to enrich the wider debate of urban division and segregation within urban studies and planning literature.

ii. Re-thinking divided cities

It has been suggested that cities in general are undergoing "a radical restructuring in geographical distribution of human activity and in the political-economic dynamics of uneven geographical development" (Harvey 2001: 346). As a result, the diversity of cities and their residents' different identities has become a central topic of concern for planning policy and practice, and for urban theory in general (Fincher and Jacobs 1998: 1; Fincher and Iveson 2008: 2).

The reality of spatial, social and political divisions in cities has been recognized in urban studies for over a century. From the 1950s to the 1980s the main 'divided cities' discourse focused on themes common throughout the developed 'Western'[1] world (Safier 1997: 188). The discussion defined such cities as characterized by 'divisions' of group membership and identification, divergence in socioeconomic status, and residential segregation. This loose definition of 'divided city' spanned a wide comparative range extending from Chicago (Park et al 1925) to New York and London (Fainstein, et al 1992), Los Angeles (Soja 1996, 2000; Davis 1990, 2007; Dear 2000), Sao Paulo (Caldeira 2000; Holston 2008, 2009), London and Jerusalem (Fenster 2004) and divided cities in general (Dunn 1994; Marcuse & van Kempen 2000, 2002; Scholar 2006; van Kempen 2007; van Kempen & Murie 2009) .

The body of academic contributions on the subject of divided cities and urban segregation implicitly supports the guiding hypothesis of my research: that, in Haim

[1] The term 'Western/West' throughout is used as a simplified category to identify loosely structured bodies in wealthier countries that stem from a European historical background. I.e. Western universities; Western countries; Western cities.

Yacobi's words, "in the present global context, more and more cities are becoming polarized, ghettoized and fragmented in surprisingly similar ways" (Yacobi 2009a, preface). Yacobi raises two crucial points in this study. First, he points to the problem of understanding what kinds of conditions produce urban spatial and social polarization. Second, his argument shows how, through a careful investigation of contextual local dynamics and pre-determined themes, we might come to observe that different kinds of conflict intertwine within the same city, and different kinds of cities produce similar conflicts and segregation patterns. Moreover, according to Shechter and Yacobi (2005) the understanding of urban change in the West has experienced a shift to a more nuanced understating of urban politics and the active involvement of residents in urban decision making and planning policy,

> "Research on urbanity in the 'traditional' West has undergone a transition in the last two decades, whereby the city has been studied more closely as a socio-political arena. […] As a result, we have a sounder grasp of changes, such as the organization of urban regimes and the mobilization of urban dwellers from above and below, which are re-shaping city life. We are also more attuned to the role of complex social relations in urban planning and urban policies" (Shechter and Yacobi 2005: 183).

Following the above observation about the socio-spatial complexity of contemporary urban planning and policy it is crucial to understand urban segregation as "a multi-dimensional process requiring a multi-disciplinary approach" (Vaughan and Arbaci 2011) Within this discussion, there is still a significant lacuna as to how researchers and policymakers themselves conceptualize and prioritize the socially and politically contentious issues of urban segregation in different cities and the "challenges of understanding urban segregation" (ibid). As Holston (2009) explains in the quote below, these challenges have grown massively throughout the twentieth century, and become a wide-reaching challenge for the future stability of cities and their residents:

> The extraordinary urbanization of the 20th century has produced urban peripheries of devastating poverty and inequality in cities worldwide (Holston 2009: 245).

To conceptually grasp this from a planning perspective, Yiftachel (2009a, 2009b) coins the term "grey space"; arguing "in a major part of the world – including the

'West' - urban growth is taking place in informal settlements constituting of developments partially external to the institutionalized planning system" (ibid 2009b: 89). Yiftachel further notes that "it also requires the development of 'insurgent planning' (Holston, 2007 in Yiftachel 2009a), that runs against the logic of domination and exploitation which stand behind the very making of marginalized grey space, and its discursive criminalization by urban policy and discourse" (Yiftachel 2009a: 97-98). Mass urbanization has also meant that cities have developed special domains or reputations to compete and attract attention and investments on a global scale. This urban specialization has been illustrated by Bell and de Shalit (2011) who note that "clearly, some cities do express and prioritize different social and political values: what we can call an 'ethos' or 'spirit' of a city" (Bell and de Shalit 2011: 2).

The two cities chosen here represent what are perceived as containing a binary "ethos" or "spirit". Jerusalem is labeled the 'city of religion' (ibid 2011: 14, Fenster 2004), the"ultimate contested city" (Shlay and Rosen 2010: 359) or the "colonial city" (Yiftachel 2006). Stockholm, on the other hand, is known to be a world model for urban sustainability (Metzger and Rader Olsson 2014) and for its progressive planning system (Lundström et al 2013). The choice in what could arguably be critiqued as a unusual set of cities to compare was made intentionally to enhance the understanding of the urban conditions on the ground through a comparative investigation of urban difference (McFarlane & Robinson 2012).

There is a theoretical and methodological danger here of collapsing into a deterministic proposition trap that all or most of today's cities are undergoing similar division and segregation processes. It has been suggested by leading academics in urban studies that "we need to think about the ways in which we do comparative research […] there is a danger of disconnecting the analysis from its post-colonial roots" (Amin 2013). It is important to clarify that this is not the main argument emerging from the current research. Rather, the aim is to search for "universal causality" across different contexts based on similar outcomes (Robinson 2011: 5) or via "pluralist causalities" (Pickvance 1986). This is in order to carefully map and analyze defined patterns from different cities (housing, transport and civil society involvement in planning, in the current study) revealing observations about the

development of similar patterns in cities so different that they were previously deemed to be incommensurable (Robinson 2011).

With this background in mind, my argument should be examined particularly in relation to the emerging body of literature on extreme ethnically 'contested cities' and 'divided cities'. This 'list' of cities which purport to manifest extreme, ethno-national divisions emanating from active national conflicts and disputes about the legitimacy of the nation state itself (Brand et al 2008: 4; Anderson 2008: 6; Calame & Charlesworth 2009: 2) includes Baghdad, Beirut, Belfast, Derry/Londonderry, Jerusalem, Mostar, Nicosia, Kirkuk and Sarajevo, to mention but a few of the most prolific and widely researched.

A substantial number of scholars claim that distinctive attributes and tensions position these cities within an exclusive body of knowledge that distinguishes them from other urban categories (see for example: Bollens 1998, 2007; Conflict in Cities Project 2008; Calame and Charlesworth 2009, Gaffikin and Morrissey 2011). I suggest, in this study, these exemplars can all be articulated as members of the 'Extreme Divided Cities Discourse' (EDCD hereafter) focusing on 'Extreme Divided Cities' (EDC hereafter[2]). The EDCD analyzes urban transformations through Western planning theories and their applicability in extreme cases of 'divided' or 'contested' cities; on the other hand much less attention has been given within the EDCD to practical planning experience and what can be learned from it in other less extreme divided cities "at different stages of transition" (Forum for Cities in Transition 2010, FCT, hereafter).

However, as I would suggest, such a categorization of cities is questionable, since as indicated by Hepburn (2004: 7), ethnic conflicts in contested cities differ little in some respects from modes of ethnic relations observed in all cities where there are ethnic divisions. More recently Bollens (2012: 23) suggests "these 'abnormal' cities… provide informative windows into the role of urban policy vis-à-vis ethnicity, and the ways in which people deal with each other in so-called 'normal' cities of North

[2] Extreme Divided City (EDC) and Extreme Divided Cities Discourse (EDCD) are interchangeable throughout the text. They relate to the same concept of cities that have been grouped together as described above. EDC relates to the urban condition itself, while EDCD relates to the academic discourse about it.

America, Western Europe and elsewhere in the world." A related argument with further theoretical implications suggests:

> "[…] instead of creating separate categories of cities and then trying to make room for deviant cases, one should identify drives of spatial division and then determine how and to what extent they operate and interact in each specific urban context under investigation" (Allegra, et al 2012: 561).

There is a growing interest within urban studies research and literature to open up the continued use of separate categories and labels attached to specific cities. Following the quote above; this research intends to "identify [specific] drives of spatial division" (ibid) and to analyze how they "operate and interact in each specific urban context under investigation" (ibid). To start establishing such a critical framework for EDC/EDCD I suggest that there is a need to re-think current categories and labels across two specific case studies representing 'different division patterns' in a comparative perspective. The significance of comparing different cities with diverse histories and contexts was recently advanced by Jennifer Robinson (2006, 2011). Robinson frames the term 'ordinary cities', suggesting a different cosmopolitan approach to post-colonial urbanism. Robinson (2006: 109) claims "[t]he consequences of thinking of all cities as ordinary are substantial, with implications for the direction of urban policy and for our assessment of the potential futures of all sorts of different cities".

Indeed, my argument takes forward Robinson's (2006) call to develop a post-colonial urban theory that defines new ways of dealing with differences among cities. Robinson's contribution to my discussion lies in her questioning of given categorizations of cities (i.e. 'developed' or 'developing', 'modern' or 'primitive', 'colonial' or 'post-colonial') and their assumed hierarchies within a global order (Robinson 2006: 41). Though I adopt Robinson's analytical framework, I differ from her rejection of the relevance of such categories. Instead I would suggest a more nuanced study of urban spaces which does not put cities in a certain location on the continuum (in my case between the 'divided' and the 'ordinary') but rather a study of cities along thematic patterns revealing different scales of segregation, and focusing on three main themes: transport infrastructure, housing and NGO involvement in planning.

Following Robinson's proposal, 'ordinary cities' will serve as a general category for the comparison of division and segregation in different cities predominantly in Europe and specifically in the two selected case studies: Jerusalem and Stockholm. It is important to note, this is not the first geographical investigation comparing urban planning in 'different' cities. Tovi Fenster's comparative research of Jerusalem and London published in her book *The Global City and the Holy City* (2004) lays out a carefully presented evaluation of the two cities through the "notions of culture, gender and power" (Fenster 2004: 61). The study highlights the dynamics of globalization and nationalism as major forces shaping urban exclusion and inclusion. Within the globalization framework, on a national scale Jerusalem, was labeled a *global locality* and Tel Aviv[3] branded a *local globality*; outlining the different roles these two central cities have within the Israeli globalization context (Alfasi and Fenster 2009: 544).

iii. Redefining urban segregation and division

While reading about divided cities and urban segregation more generally, I realized that over the last few decades a division between two separate discourses has emerged. The first focuses on globalization, neo-liberalism and its related social exclusion within inequality related segregation discourses. The second reproduces the extreme EDC category that focuses on the more visible disruptive contestations of urban space within contestations of the nation state. Emerging in parallel with the EDC, and to some extent attempting to bridge the two separate discourses of the EDC and 'ordinary cities', is '*military urbanism'* or in Stephen Graham's (2004: 4) words, "a geopolitical and strategic reshaping of our world based heavily on a proliferation of organized, extremely violent acts against cities, those who live in them, and the support systems that make them work" that leads to the "insuperability of war, terror, place annihilation, and modern urbanism" (Graham 2004: 33). Graham's two tomes, *Cities, Wars and Terrorism* (2004) and *Cities Under Siege* (2010), focus on the extreme conditions of urban crisis created by acts of violence, growing insecurity and the militarization of urban space.

[3] Israel's 'global city' and its main financial and cultural hub.

This study will critically adopt the core principles of these discourses, both the globalizing effects of nationalism, and the militarization of urban space, while paying attention to more long-term processes relating to how planning policy, migration and ethnicity affects the urban sphere. As such, it focuses in more detail on the subject of '*urban segregation'* - used to analyze and measure more long term conditions of spatial and social divisions in cities (Musterd et al 1998, 2006; Musterd 2005, Marcuse & van Kempen 2000; Andersson 1999, 2003, 2007; Varady 2006; Schönwälder 2007; Wacquant 1997, 2007, 2008a, 2008b; Nightingale 2012). Setting the extreme urban conditions of cities in the EDCD against emerging urban segregation and divisions in other, more 'ordinary' cities has been insufficiently analyzed so far. Moreover, the connections between the existing bodies of knowledge on globalization, military urbanism, urban segregation and the EDCD has not been addressed in an extensive multi scalar framework.

This research suggests that rather than limiting the use of the EDC to a select number of extreme cases, there is an increasing interest in broadening the category itself. This is of growing significance given that cities are becoming the prime location of new modes of 'insurgent citizenship' (Holston 1995, 2008, 2009) and the key sites in an interconnected global economy reducing the prominence of the historical nation state (Sassen 1991/2001; Castells 1996). Furthermore, as Alfasi and Fenster (2009: 545) note, there is a need to go beyond the binary division of global/local and look at the complex effects of globalization on cities from new perspectives; to serve an increasing requirement to better understand and adapt planning policy and practice to ethnic minorities and migrants in an ever more fracturing urban social and spatial reality.

My aims in writing this PhD are threefold. First, to research in-depth, empirically grounded case studies of two different cities; one labeled as 'ordinary' (Stockholm) and one 'deeply divided' (Jerusalem) to understand their differences and similarities as an attempt to critique the EDCD. My second ambition is to de-exceptionalize Jerusalem as a singular case of extreme urban division. I do so using Flyvbjerg's (2006, 2011) theoretical case study tags of 'paradigmatic case study' and his de-exceptionalization of 'extreme' and 'critical' cases, to explain the growing causal

similarity and difference of urban divisions and segregation across different political and ethnic contexts.

Thirdly, it is my aim to use the findings from my research to address recent changes in the contemporary urban present and in so doing I hope to shape and advance a general theoretical and practical understanding of urban division and segregation bridging the current lacuna in the literature that differentiates extremely divided cities from other, more ordinary urban areas. I will attempt to establish this idea (as a working hypothesis rather than as a verified statement) partly with the help of the existing literature and partly through field work and interviews as well as personal participatory observations in my two selected case studies: Stockholm and Jerusalem.

iv. The case studies - Jerusalem and Stockholm

The recent outbreak of riots and violence in the northern Stockholm suburb of Husby on the 19th of May 2013 and spreading to other Stockholm 'immigrant suburbs' gives a new level of relevance to my earlier observations. Moreover, this is not the first occurrence of riots in Swedish immigrant-dense neighborhoods. Referring to the 2004 urban riots and violence in a Malmö immigrant neighborhood, Guy Baeten notes, "[t]he location of the trouble reinforces the argument: even mythically tolerant Sweden cannot handle this major urban transformation and its cities are now facing uproar and street violence" (Baeten 2007: 44). This is further reiterated by Lars Marcus who commented that "Swedish society is imbued with the issue of segregation" (Marcus 2007: 252). Marcus further stressed how Stockholm's past suburban planning has created such conditions, arguing that "[t]he suburban landscape of Stockholm is programmatically divided into enclaves following the directions and planning ideals of the post-war era" (ibid 2007: 256). Equally telling are the words of Alen Pred from his ground-breaking book documenting the rise of racial segregation in Sweden:

> "In Sweden, at least, cultural racialization, the growth of racialized (suburban) spaces, and the popular imagination of those spaces and their inhabitants continue to emerge out of one another […] In Sweden, at

> least, for those who have become racialized the experience of racism often remains as acute and painful as ever, if not more so" (Pred 2000: 269).

In this respect, I maintain that Stockholm and Jerusalem are distinct in terms of their history and processes that have caused their divisions. In Jerusalem; "planning and development […] under the existing situation and status, are highly affected by the geo-political and ethno-national conflict over the status and future of the city" (Khamaisi 2010: 20). Accordingly, "[g]eographical-administrative criteria inevitably involve normative judgment and may be viewed as implicitly political; the professional jargon masks political preferences" (Razin and Hazan 2004: 79). On the other hand, in terms of the spatial manifestation of social divisions, the resemblance to other cities is growing. With this proposition in mind a central claim I make in this thesis is that extreme division processes that manifested as a result of ethnic segregation and exclusion have more in common between cities than formerly perceived. Or in other words, urban segregation in 'different cities' has more in common than previously considered in urban studies and planning literature. This is usually related to "[s]ystemic discrimination and neglect embodied in state institutions at the city and supra-urban levels [which] are central to almost all civic conflicts" (Beall et al 2013: 3073).

As such, the recent violent clashes in segregated immigrant neighborhoods of Stockholm can be seen as an important consideration in the adaptation of future inclusive planning policy and practice in a growing number of cities worldwide. While the images of violence in cities such as Jerusalem and Stockholm both produce global media attention and external interest, these dark moments of outrage and clashes are only the peak indicators of much deeper and longer processes of spatial and social discrimination and inequality. The hope that lies in such expressions of rage and discontent towards a dominant majority culture is that transformation to a more just system is viable, or in the words of renowned political theorist Hannah Arendt:

> "Only where there is reason to suspect that conditions could be changed and are not does rage arise" (Arendt 1969: 63).

Jerusalem and Stockholm are the two case study cities forming the empirical and theoretical grounding in my research. One could easily claim they have rather different histories and urban qualities which is precisely why they were selected. They represent different extremes of cities within a polarizing urban world. The reason for choosing the two and not others is because they hold different, almost contrasting, positions along several important parameters seen as measurements of a segregated city. These different parameters include, to list some prevalent examples (among several others); (1) the limit of minority access to decision making arenas; (2) discriminatory housing provision; (3) discriminatory planning policy addressing minority rights; (4) discriminatory investment in infrastructure development.

Within the two cities the selection of a local case proved an extensive process where a few relevant neighborhoods where first identified, and then assessed before a final local case study for each was chosen. The rationale behind choosing the specific neighborhoods included several key factors. The specifics of these factors and why they were chosen to identify the case studies will be discussed in detail in chapter three (see: chapter 3, below). To briefly outline some of the central factors here, these were: (1) the high percentage of minorities (in the Jerusalem case Palestinians and in the Stockholm case immigrants); (2) the level of documented segregation; (3) the availability of research materials; (4) accessibility of contacts'; and (5) the geographical location in the city. The two local cases chosen – Fittja in the southern fringes of Stockholm and Al-Isawiyyah in Jerusalem, located on what was no-man's land between Jordan and Israel until 1967 – are both suffering from growing levels of extreme segregation deepened over the last two decades. The reasons for and implications of these deep levels of urban segregation will be further addressed and analyzed from different scales and perspectives in detail within the substantive chapters of this research.

v. Research questions and methodology

My initial working research hypothesis was that urban social, political and spatial segregation patterns within traditional EDC cities and other 'ordinary' ethnically divided cities are becoming more alike. While the EDCD focuses on urban areas within extreme ethno-national conflicts and some of them involve an active

occupation, I argue that ethnic segregation in other cities is becoming increasingly divisive with similar exclusionary effects. I will, accordingly, investigate the similarities and differences of the 'extreme divided city' category as part of the 'ordinary city' framework. The overall aim of the research is to establish the first steps in *a multi-scalar comparative framework* of 'extreme divide cities' and 'ordinary divided cities'. Thus, the main issue this research aims to address is:

How is urban segregation conceptualized and acted upon at different scales and stages of bottom-up and top-down initiatives of urban policy formation in different political, social and cultural contexts?

Core research question:

How and in what ways is urban segregation in 'ordinary cities' becoming increasingly similar or different to urban segregation in EDC cities?

To focus the research, I will ask the above core research question, answered in detail through two further sub-questions:

1. *What are the structural or political reasons for the continued increase of urban segregation at different scales in Israel and Sweden in general, and in Jerusalem and Stockholm in particular?* (Investigated in the background - planning and geopolitics see: chapter 3).

2. *What is the impact of housing and planning policy at both the national and city scales on the social and spatial segregation of the two case study neighborhoods (Al-Isawiyyah and Fittja) and what are the planners', local communities' and NGOs' observations of these processes?* (Investigated in the local case studies and field research, see: chapter 4).

Following a broad theoretical assessment of 'urban segregation' in **Chapter 1,** the research will focus on two nations with diverse forms of urban segregation with the aim of "learning through differences, rather than seeking out similarities" (Robinson

2011, McFarlane & Robinson 2012). The comparative framework and other methodological tools will be further outlined in **Chapter 2**. A wider review of planning and geopolitics across different scales (national, regional and urban) in Israel and Sweden and Jerusalem and Stockholm is carried out in **Chapter 3**. The neighbourhood scale research is based on the two selected local case studies of Al-Isawiyyah and Fittja and is outlined in further detail in the field research analysis in **Chapter 4**. The proposed research will analyze how concepts, methodologies and policies regarding the consequences and approaches to manage socio-spatial disparities in cities, are devised, transferred and negotiated between different actors and institutions. This is elaborated in the comparative discussion of the findings in **Chapter 5**.

The significance of this research lies in the current lacuna in the academic urban studies and planning literature that does not link the EDC in a comprehensive framework to other 'ordinary cities'. This study attempts to make this link by attending to the differences and similarities of urban planning policy on the ground between these kinds of cities. Both the connection between planning and urban segregation and the differentiation between EDC and 'ordinary cities' have been extensively studied. However, this study argues that learning from 'extreme divided cities' to uncover and analyze planning policy and practice in less extreme cases has yet to be substantiated. This study is significant because it explores this academic gap.